DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 186 299 SO 012 496

AUTHOR Jagodzinski, John
TITLE Towards a New Aesthetic. Occasional Paper No. 12. Curriculum, Media & Instruction.
INSTITUTION Alberta Univ., Edmonton. Faculty of Education.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 17p.; For a related document, see SO 012 490.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Aesthetic Education; Art Education; Artists; Educational Philosophy; Elementary Secondary Education; Existentialism; Higher Education; Humanism; *Philosophy; Position Papers; *Theories
IDENTIFIERS *Hermeneutics; *Phenomenology; *Praxiology

ABSTRACT

The essay argues that current artistic practices reflect a dated formalistic aesthetic, and that the hermeneutic-phenomenological position, although superior to the formalist approach, is limited. (Hermeneutics is a study of the methodological principles of interpretation; phenomenology is an ethnographic, historical, and/or crosscultural analysis of a phenomenon.) A new aesthetic direction is proposed. The author identifies three deep anthropological interests which characterize man: the interest in controlling an objectified environmental world; in communication, characterized by the hermeneutic-phenomenological sciences; and in emancipatory self-reflection. An historical overview proves that the development of Western art reflects man's need to control his environment. This "scientific formalistic aesthetic" exists at the expense of the other two interests. Hermeneutics and phenomenology have provided new stimulus for research in art education since the mid 1800s by recognizing man as an historical, cultural, and valuing creature. However, emphasis is given to the selection, mediation, and interpretation of aesthetic information, minimizing man's most important achievement -- the active shaping and modification of himself and the environment. Thus, a new direction, praxiology, is preferred. The approach is characterized by a political and moral commitment which is in a state of constant antagonism with reality. The praxiological artist must be a critical philosopher who creates visual discourse which raises the viewer's sensitivity to the reality of the human environment. (Author/KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED186299

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Towards A New Aesthetic

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
T. Aoki
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

John Jagodzinski

The University of Alberta

Occasional Paper No. 12

Department of Secondary Education
Faculty of Education The University of Alberta

Curriculum, Media & Instruction

SP012496

FEB 1

A Note to The Reader: Pivoted in the world of Art Education, John Jagodzinski, the author of this CMI Occasional Paper, describes an artist in his various historical moods. Grounding himself in a philosophical anthropological framework, he advances a "licentious" thesis:

> *Current classroom practices in art education embrace an aesthetic theory which is dated at least four hundred years; current pedagogy is dominated by a formalistic aesthetic which legitimates the process of art as "cathartic", . . . current artworks are envisioned as "beautiful", implying an "ornamental utilitarianism".*

The author does not leave the reader there, but leads him on to a realm of art education embedded in hermeneutic phenomenology, in which recognition is given to man as "an historical, cultural and valuing creature . . . giving meaning to his symbol-making activities". Dissatisfied with the lack of attention given to the reconstruction of aesthetic reality, he then moves on into the realm of praxiological aesthetic, committed to a political and moral stance. Within this orientation, aesthetic education implies for the author, an insistence on social change by showing the unacceptability of any alienating human situation and by calling out to our morals for change.

For those of us whose curricular interests are not formally in art education, we will do well to remember that as educators we dwell, nevertheless, in a human and social world. And if we believe that to be human is to create, regardless of our area of specialization, the conceptions that John entertains seem to merit attention for their implications for curriculum and instruction.

TOWARDS A NEW AESTHETIC

John Jagodzinski*

This essay argues that current artistic practices in the classroom reflect a formalist aesthetic which is dated at least four-hundred years. The hermeneutic-phenomenological position, which is gaining currency in art education, is infinitely superior to the formalist approach but, it is argued, it too falls short of a potentially "full" human aesthetic. A new aesthetic direction is proposed.

Recent exploration into the realm of philosophical anthropology by such eminent socio-philosophers as K.O. Apel, J. Habermas, P. Bordieux et al.[1] provide, I believe, a theoretical foundation which permits the formulation of the following licentious thesis: *current classroom practices in art education embrace an aesthetic theory which is dated at least four-hundred years; current artistic pedagogy is dominated by a formalist aesthetic*[2] *which legitimates the process of art as "cathartic", i.e., aesthetic experience is defined as a therapeutic release of emotion and the product of art as "mimetic" and "illusionistic"; current artworks are envisioned as "beautiful", implying an "ornamental" utilitarianism.*

In contrast to the above view, a new aesthetic position is gaining prominence.[3] This position, embraced by the hermeneutic-phenomenological sciences,[4] views art primarily as a communicative activity. The process of art is envisioned as an attempt to interpret man's "being-in-the-world" and the art product is no longer dichotomized into being either "good" or "bad", "ugly" or "beautiful", but is viewed as a representative of the life-world[5] of the culture which produced it. Artworks are surface appearances, Wittgensteinian family resemblances, which provide access to the deep structure[6] of the culture. Aesthetic experience is seen as the recovery of the life-world as presented by the artworks.[7] Stress is placed on understanding (*Verstehen*) in contrast to cause and effect explanation (*Erklaren*).[8] Truth is seen as an agreement on aesthetic values amongst participants in the artistic community (galleries, museums, media support, etc.) in contrast to nomothetic or axiomatic laws of artistic truth. It is the critic who is legitimated as possessing artistic knowledge, usually referred to as intuitive or tacit,[9] and it is he who is instrumental in achieving this consensus amongst his audience. Although the above view is "new" to art education, it too, is at least one-hundred and fifty years old, as will be discussed later.

The task of this essay is to present a philosophical anthropological framework which provides the basis for an historical assessment of man's creative endeavours and allows the claim that the above models of artistic

---

*John Jagodzinski is a doctoral student in Art Education in The Department of Secondary Education. This paper was written as an invitation to conversation not only on art education but also on anthropological interests and knowledge.

process and production are reductive of a potentially full human aesthetic. This argument, based on man's deep anthropological interests, vindicates the thesis that the current "scientific formalism" is dated; furthermore, it recognizes that the phenomenological-hermeneutic view of man's creative potential is infinitely superior to this formalism, but that this model requires the added dimensionality of a political and moral commitment to make the process and production of art emancipatory and, therefore, fully "human".

I

Philosophical anthropologists have defined three deep anthropological interests which characterize man.[10] First, there is the interest in controlling an objectified environmental world. This is a technical cognitive interest dominated by the empirical-analytical sciences which deal with the prediction and control of phenomena. Second, there is the interest in communicative understanding. This is a practical interest dominated by the hermeneutic-phenomenological sciences (*Geisteswissenschaften*) which deal with intersubjective understandings. Lastly, there is the interest in critical emancipatory self-reflection, a critically orientated methodology (i.e., social criticism, psychoanalysis) which attempts to transcend man's current actions towards himself, towards others and towards the environment in which he lives. If we keep these three interests in mind we can pursue our first argument: the development of Western Art has primarily reflected the first interest, that is, man's need to control his environment, hence, reflecting a "scientific formalist aesthetic" at the expense of his other two interests.

The development from 1450-1750,[11] of the "hard" sciences - physics, chemistry, geology, and the related field of mathematics provided man with his "break with nature". The domination of nature was the gradual achievemt of the humanists.[12] These pseudo-artist-engineers, beginning with Brunelleschi on through the theory and practices of Ghilberti, Alberti, Biringucci, Da Vinci, Cellini, Durer, etc., invented war machines, built fortresses, cathedrals, designed dykes, canals, bridges and numerous other mechanical devices.[13] The use of perspective and geometry elevated the artist-engineer from the ranks of a manual worker to that of a literati, a practitioner of one of the liberal arts, but this newly found status also meant that the practice of art was defined by a scientific theory. The representation of nature through illusionistic space, the depiction of the tangibility of "things", reflected perfectly the emerging scientific outlook which needed to come to grips with an "objective" reality.[14]

What had been treatises and scattered monograms or color theory perspective, chiaroscuro, beauty, imitation of nature, etc., became systematized by the royal academies of art (1600-1750),[15] which institutionalized the

classical aesthetic principles of mimesis and catharsis. Art was said to represent reality through the practice of a set of axiomatic principles established in the areas of geometry, perspective, and anatomy. These principles closely paralleled the scientific principles developed by Descartes and Pascal who were both members of the *Academie des Sciences*.

The absolutist and mercantilist policies of Colbert and Lebrun, successive directors of the French Academies, provided the educative model for the 18th and 19th centuries. Their adoption of a Newtonian logo-centric world-view, based on a clear, unswerving faith in mathematically provable rules defined nature as *natura naturans*. Nature and Reason became synonymous. "Natural" aesthetics equated truth and beauty as expressions of an underlying inviolable order of being. Poussin's emphasis on line, structure and geometric order, Boileau's *L'Art Poetique* and Corneille's dramatic principles of action legitimated the Cartesian rationalist philosophy for the arts.

With the development of the science of biology (1750-1850) a biocentric world-view came to fore.[16] The change towards a *natura naturanta,* defined nature in terms of change and process, but ultimately traceable to a mathematical pattern. The dichotomy of primary and secondary qualities, as developed by Lockean philosophy, gave way to a radical empiricism which viewed all knowledge as sense experience. Artists valued colors, sounds, odors - the very subjective, everchanging elements of the phenomenal world of experience. Wordsworth's poems dealt with incidents and situations from common life. They were a frank appeal to the empirical reality of spoken English. The Platonic deductive epistemology of the Enlightenment was overthrown by the inductive method of natural biology which was an approach to pure fact through the senses. Aesthetics as mimesis changed its character from a generic position - the reflection of a static immutable world, to a genetic position - the reflection of nature as changeable and transformable. Imagination and genius became incorporated into the artistic process to help explain the emerging concepts of transformation, genotype, gestalt and typology. Despite the "romantic rebellion"[17] and *L'art pour l'art* movement, the general character of plastic space did not change. Romanticism was a revolt against the loss of individuality concomitant with industrialization.[18] It was an attempt to rekindle an awareness of nature which expressed itself through the aesthetic values of sublimity and picturesqueness as developed by the British empiricist aestheticians[19] (Dennis, Hume, Lord Kames, Burke) and elaborated through Hogarth's stress on the ideal "precise serpentine line", and Reynold's discourses on ideal beauty.

When one considers the naturalism (realism) of Zola and Courbet (ca. 1880), the aesthetics of Taine, the paintings of Turner and Constable and the development of French Impressionism, we realize that the period from

1830-1900 was the first real attempt by the artist to break away from the Cartesian straight jacket which had been imposed on him. However, the "Romantic" artist's mandate was still to represent Essential Reality.[20] This time he adopted the new emerging scientific empiricism known as "positivism".[21] Like the scientist, the artist was essentially engaged in pure empirical research characterized by an objectivity which Ruskin praised as the recovery of the "innocent eye", a view best exemplified by Seurat who performed many experiments before he dared apply his Machian atoms of paint on his final product.[22]

A re-evaluation of the meaning and conventions of art took place around the beginnings of the twentieth century. However, the technological interest remained dominant. The majority of the artists placed their faith in the potential of the scientific revolution. They chose to investigate the technological environment. The exploration of the man-made environment kept abreast of scientific inquiry into material, space, time, energy, architectonics and the nature of perception. Impressionists were influenced by the positivist psychology of Helmholtz and Wundt; Post-Impressionists seemed to follow Mach's vision of the atom; Fauvism concerned itself with the dispensation of local color; Cubism dealt with the relativity of space; Purism dealt with clarity and objectivity; Futurism dealt with speed; Suprematists, Constructivists and Bauhaus patterned themselves on the mechanical sciences; De Stijl, a neo-plasticist, based his art on the mathematics of Schoenmaeker.[23] Abstract Expressionism came to terms with quantum physics - Neil Bohr's "complementarity thesis" and Hiesenberg's "uncertainty and indeterminacy principles". The incorporation of chance and an "all-overness" (no special foci of interest) as part of the artistic process had its counterpart in statistics and organizational theory.[24] Like statistics, the abstract expressionists used an if-then argument *paribus ceteris*. Given the performance of an initial act through chance, the artist would attempt to work out its possibilities to their logical conclusion. This meant an active involvement on his part and a conscious attempt to keep certain variables constant (i.e., gesture, value range, number of colors, etc.) and alter others with the next "accident". Through this active involvement, order was created from a seemingly chaotic series of events. This reflected a Whiteheadian metaphysics which envisioned a continuous occurring of events in space. Recently, one may add Minimal Art, Ecological Art, Cool Art, Anti-form, Art Povera, Kinetic Art as other movements which reflect an "aestheticism" parallel to the "scientism" of a positivist philosophy.[25]

To account for the concepts of mutation and evolution which could not be adequately explained by the former biocentric world-view, a neopositivism was needed. A new scientific *Weltanschuung*, usually synonymous with Popperism,[26] met the challenge. Popper views the growth of science in general systems terms.[27] All knowledge is falsifiable and provisional. As new information is uncovered and anomalies build up, a new unifying theory needs to be found which accounts for all new phenomena, causing the system to change and science to "progress". Art, also has adopted this technological sophistication through the notion of the *avant-garde*[28] which is defined as the artist's ability to innovate, discover and change at a rate comparable with technological change.

This modernism has now become a system theory aesthetic,[29] a neo-formalism. In this view, tools, from the simplest hand implements to the most sophisticated computers, are extensions of man's attempt to shape his environment. In this same sense, artistic symbols are also seen as human extensions. They are conventions and, therefore, falsifiable, which structure the human evnironment thus allowing man to adapt to it. Pulsa[30] members talk of the computer as an environmental sensing device which structures the human participation in the environment. Art, broadened to include a systems approach, is supposed to sensitize the participant to the information in the environment which is normally ignored. Through such sensitization the aesthetic experience is said to improve the individual's personality. He is now aware of impinging visual stimuli. Art environments are treated as "pure" lived experience, (e.g., the Gemini space environment considered to be the epitome of achievement). However, nowhere can Max Bense nor Abraham Moles,[31] leading exponents of this view, explain the ways a code is altered by a viewer or how artists apply freedom of choice to alter and select alternate codes, nor the nature of the satisfaction accompanying a respondent's surprise on finding that a work departs from previously known codes. In short, information theory and neo-formalism refer to man's rational faculty, not to his *whole* personality. It is too reductive a view of human nature. The application of an empirico-analytic methodology towards the theory and practice of art cannot deal with a human value dimension, nor with a socio-historical demension. If the above historical preview has some validity, then we may claim that the development of Western art foom 1450 to present has been characterized by a formalism concomitant to the positivism of the natural sciences. This has been the *dominant* aesthetic reflecting man's interest in prediction and control of his environment.

II

Fortunately, not all artists at the century's turn followed the technological myth. Some artists tried to oppose these myths by creating a counter-cultural art or by adopting an idealist phenomenological aesthetic. Symbolism was the first movement to attempt to paint an "inside view" of other cultures.[32] Gauguin's explorations in the South Sea Islands, Van Gogh's travels to Dordrecht and the early fascinations with the Japanese and primitive cultures were all attempts at an "emic" anthropological view. Cezanne's search for structure was also essentially a phenomenological approach.[33] Expressionism (Blaue Reiter and Die Bruke), Surrealism and Dada were further resurrections of the "spirituality" concomitant to Husserl's explorations into the transcendental ego. Finally, abstract art, beginning with Kandinsky's *innerer Klang* theory,[34] justified the turn towards the idealism of Schopenhauer, Nietzche and Bergson. All the above were attempts to explore man's inner consciousness, a short

lived attempt when one considers the inordinate amount of time that had been devoted towards a formalist approach.

The hermeneutic-phenomenological science provided a possible path to reach these recesses of the mind. Their institutionalization reflects man's second interest - the need for communication and understanding. For analytical purposes it may be best to examine their origins in two distinct phases.

First, hermeneutics, as interpretation theory, began with Biblical exegesis. It was the achievement of the Left Hegelians who felt that Hegel's rationalism hadn't gone far enough. D.F. Strauss's *Life of Jesus* (1836) was the first attempt to demystify the Christian miracles through a rational explanation. Finding the "historical" Christ became one step from a series which further elaborated the historical sciences (history, historiography, historicism). Secondly, phenomenology in its most "open" definition, was the achievement of anthropology [Tylor (1840) and Morgan (1851)].[35] An "emic" approach towards the understanding of other cultures meant the development of alternative research methods than those provided by the natural sciences. Philosophically, Husserl's[36] post-Kantian approach to man's consciousness through an eidetic reduction, led directly towards Heidegger and existentialism.

Both of these directions have provided new stimulus for research in art education.[37] Their main contribution for art educators has been the disappearance of the subject-object dichotomy. The examination of consciousness is made at the pre-reflective level - the world as it is immediately given. Consciousness becomes intentionality. It is always conscious of something, never an empty state nor a tangible "thing". Man's consciousness "grasps" the objective world and thereby subjectivizes it through his own selective processes. Aesthetic experience is what happens in this moment of disinterestedness. It is a historical moment since it embodies the perceiver's past, present and future expectations. Man is said to be constantly involved in a hermeneutic circle.[38] Each new interpretation of an artwork opens up the potential for yet another, fuller interpretation *(Vorverstandnis)*. The artwork is perceived as an open system whose sum of interpretations (parts) is greater than its whole.

The recognition of an active mind, a Kantian achievement, introduces a value dimension which the technological sciences did not have as part of their epistemology.[39] The recovery of the pre-reflective experiences of art permits a fuller understanding of the things themselves as well as providing clues to the possible causes why a perceiver values and understands a particular work of art - a question which has held high honors in art education since the publication of Lowenfeld's *Creative and Mental Growth* in 1947.

Continental phenomenology,[40] as briefly defined above, is but one avenue to the understanding of socially constructed reality of our taken-for-granted world.[41] Some philosophers argue that it is the only proper "scientific" method which the social sciences have at the moment.[42] It must be stated that participant observation, the new ethnography, "thick description," ethnomethodology, provide yet other alternatives.[43] That only four articles appeared in *Studies in Art Education*[44] which dealt with "phenomenological" research of any kind is indicative of the stress placed on empirico-analytical research in art education and on the promotion of a formalist aesthetic.

III

Artistic response, which awards man's aesthetic sensibilities to the control of his environment, performing essentially an adaptive function is that part of his human nature which he shares with all other animals. A formalist aesthetic, which relies on the prediction and control of human aesthetic response, is largely based on the above assumption.[45] It is biological determinism. It assumes that aesthetic information processes are the same cross-culturally. Man, however, is not totally defined by his biological needs. He is aware of his historical roots and the possibilities of his future. He can transcend his biological limitations through a cultural reality which "humanizes" him.

The hermeneutic-phenomenological view of aesthetic sensibilities recognizes that man is an historical, cultural, and valuing creature. There is a recognition that man gives meaning to his symbol-making activities. However, not enough attention is paid to the reconstruction of his social reality. Emphasis is given to the selection, mediation, and interpretation of aesthetic information minimizing man's most important achievement - the active shaping and modification of himself and his environment. It is one thing to understand the world, yet another to change it. This is his emancipatory interest.

An emancipatory aesthetic includes the notion of becoming which in turn, implies the notion of history. Man's creative powers are rooted in his social history. His actions and reflections are based on previous historical experiences. His consciousness is not only shaped by these past events, but are also conditioned by his current social reality. In this view, nature is no longer an antiseptic "given", but is part of human nature. Man's consciousness not only reflects the objective world of nature; it also creates it!

An emancipatory aesthetic incorporates man's two previous interests into a new synthesis (*Aufhebung*). This implies that a "higher" - more encompassing, more human view of aesthetic response may be reached. Such a view no longer sees art as mere form (as the scientific view suggests), nor as mere content (as the heurmeneutic-phenomenological sciences suggest), but as content having become form. By this I mean

that an aesthetic transformation has been achieved through the reshaping of perception and understanding so that the essence of reality becomes revealed.[46]

Essence of reality is synonymous with the truth of reality. Truth of reality, as defined in a liberating artwork, means that it represents a repressed human potential. Its truth lies in its power to break the monopoly of established reality which is preventing the attainment of a higher synthesis. It provides a counter-consciousness to the existing order by transcending the given appearances, thereby attempting to make explicit a deeper truth through the presentation of its opposite. Such art may transcend the socio-historical period. It does not invalidate the possibility of trans-historical "truths", (i.e., equality, liberty, justice, freedom) which man defines ideally but enacts marginally.

This dialectical view of artistic truth incorporates both the *is* (the examination of which has been the territory of the natural sciences) and the *ought* (a realm traditionally governed by the humanistic sciences) into a new synthesis - hereby identified as *praxiology*[47] which subjects both theory and practice to the political and moral dimensions. For any new synthesis to occur, it requires action and action implies politics. Furthermore, the projection of a new synthesis requires reflection. This reflection must assess the current situation (the *is*) and make explicit the pre-suppositions underlying the projection of future values (the *ought*). This requires a moral decision.

A praxiological aesthetic is decisively humanistic and existentialistic. Recognizing the openness of human nature, an apocalyptic contingency is conceivable. However, the artist must show it to be avoidable. He must account for his actions as the realization of his identity. Conscience becomes the backdrop of his behavior. An art which can reject present dehumanization leads to a search for a new and improved self-image. This art needs to discredit current technological myths (i.e., efficiency and separation of theory and practice by the division of labour). Artistic behavior is not a systematized set of rules of conduct promulgated by a bureaucratic mechanistic order which needs to be identified through elaborate factor analysis of semantic differentials. It is a political and moral commitment which is in a state of constant antagonism with reality. It insists on social change because it participates in the creation of a system which offers greater sanity, humanity and justice - with no illusion as to its certitude. It attempts to show the alienation of the human situation and expresses an unacceptable image of it by calling out to our morals for change.

The praxiological artist must be a critical philosopher who creates visual discourse which raises the viewer's sensitivity to the reality of

the human environment and questions the prevailing motivations and presuppositions which help shape it. Aesthetic experience is seen as a change of consciousness - a transvaluation and a call to action. The perception of the world is altered because the conditions are created, through the artwork, which reveal the ideological and economic underpinnings of a given culture. Creative freedom is directly related to the urgent problems of a technological society. It is no longer perceived as the capricious manipulation of color and form. This allows for an art which attempts to deal with the actual events of the real world, the world of politics, money-making, ecology, industry, religion, education - institutions which should be altered to provide for less dehumanization and alienation. This art deals with "real-time",[48] rather than any "mythical time" (ideal historical time). It is not separated from the day-to-day events. There is no separation of logic from feeling, or cognition from perception, or feeling from intuition as in a formalist approach.

An art which explores values and makes them explicit is not a safe art. As long as the artist is not effectively critical, society will accept him; yet, he needs to oppose the values of those "gate-keepers" who perpetuate the current real-time system and prevent its development to a fuller potential. Existential artists such as Nancy Grossman, George Tooker, Francis Bacon, Edward Kienholtx, have made moves in this direction. The political art of Hans Haake, Jack Levine, Ben Shahn, Philip Evergood, and the absurd art of Swartz, Edward Paschke, the cartooning of Robert Crumb deal with the dignity of man, question his ideals of behavior and portray his expressions and emotion as truly human traits. These and many others provide us with examples of a praxiological art.

IV

Can the opening thesis be justified? Have most critics treated art in a formalist straight jacket, dwelling only on the innovative formal qualities? Should art be divorced from the history of man? After all, "Why," asked Clive Bell,[49] "should artists bother about the fate of humanity?" Should not art be seen as a "professional" activity; after all it takes many years of university training and "hard" work to "make it". As art educators, do we promote the view that art is a "packaged" activity, manipulated and supported by museums which emphasize correct directions, and provide the bureaucratic management of art through proper means of veneration and distribution of cultural ornaments? Are our art classrooms miniature museums? Do we still perceive color theories in static color wheel terms and routinely set up still-lifes for our drawing classes? Do we praise the serial paintings of Max Bill and claim that the current explosion in printmaking is the best thing that could have happened to art since the invention of the brush? Now "everyone" has an equal chance to own an original. Do we view the subject of art *sui generis*? Need the visual arts remain "boxed-in" by our own rules?

Must art remain purely visual, a la Stella, Olitski, Louis or Noland? If one reacts to the above with a "gut" level yes, then the thesis has been vindicated. We are essentially accepting a view of art which had developed in the time period from 1400-1600. Granted, the current view is a much more sophisticated positivism, but the values it adopts views man no better than a thing, an animal. Such a view of art has lost its potential to project a new reality principle. An art which does not negate current reality has lost its "primordial power" - its expressiveness. By being separated and caged in museums or business offices of multi-corporations, it has lost the soil of its birth - it dies!

FOOTNOTES

[1] Karl Otto Apel, "Types of Social Science in the Light of Human Interests of Knowledge," *Social Research* Autumn, Vol. 44, #3, 1977.
Jurgen Habermas, *Knowledge and Human Interests*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1971.
Pierre Bourdieu, "The Three Forms of Theoretical Knowledge," *Social Science Information*, 12, #1.

[2] A formalist aesthetic concerns itself only with the critical appraisal of the elements of art - line, color, balance, mass, etc. - commonly referred to as a "language of art" which needs to be decoded. See, for instance, René Berger, *The Language of Art*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1963. as an approach to formalism in art.

[3] *Presentation on Art Educational Research: Phenomenological Description, Potential for Research in Art Education*, No. 2, 1978, edited by J. Victoria and E. Sacca.

[4] See Gerard Radnitzky, *Continental Schools of Metascience*. Scandanavian University Books: Berlingska Boktryckeriet Lund, 1968.

[5] The "life-world" (*Lebenswelt*) refers to the taken-for-grantedness of lived experience. See Alfred Schutz and Thomas Luckmann's *The Structures of the Life-World*. London: Heinemann Press, 1974.

[6] The notion of "deep Structure" is problematic. As a neo-Kantian concept it does not refer to a *thing* - to a definable structure, but to the process of understanding and grasping the recovered "experience" of an artwork.

[7] The best source for this concept is Mikel Dufrenne, *Phenomenology of Aesthetic Experience*. Evanston. Northwestern University Press, 1973.

[8] This is Dilthey's distinction. See Richard Palmer, *Hermeneutics*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1969, pp. 98-123.

[9] Michael Polanyi, *The Tacit Dimension*. New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1966.

[10] See Note 1.

[11] T. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1967.

[12] E. Zilsel, "The Sociological Roots of Science," *American Journal of Sociology*, Jan. 1942, pp. 545-560.

[13]Giorgio de Santillana, "The Role of Art in the Scientific Renaissance," in *Critical Problems in the History of Science*, ed. M. Clagett, Madison, Wis., 1959, pp. 33-65.

[14]See John Berger, *Ways of Seeing*. London: Penquin Books, 1972 and E. H. Gombrich's *Art and Illusion*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1960.

[15]Nikolaus Pevsner, *Academics of Art Past and Present*. New York: Da Capo Press, 1973.

[16]Andrew G. van Melsen, *Evolution and Philosophy*. Pittsburgh, PA.: Duquesne University Press, 1965.

[17]Kenneth Clark, *The Romantic Rebellion*. London: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1973.

[18]Wylie Sypher, *The Loss of Self in Modern Literature and Art*. New York: Random House, 1962.

[19]Francis Klingender, *Art and the Industrial Revolution*. New York: Schocken Books, 1970.

[20]Raymond Williams, *Culture and Society*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1958.

[21]As coined by Augus Comte. See Leszek Kolakowski, *The Alienation of Reason: A History of Positivist Thought*. New York: Doubleday and Co. Inc., 1968.

[22]Mach perceived the atom merely as a heuristic concept, only to be reified during experiments. He was proven wrong when the explorations of quantum physics proved the existence of the atom. See John Adkins Richardson, *Modern Art and Scientific Thought*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1971.

[23]These thoughts are an extrapolation of an examination of art theories in *Concepts of Modern Art*, edited by T. Richardson and N. Stangos, Harmondsworth: Penquin Books Inc., 1974, and Herschel Chipp, *Theories of Modern Art*. Berkeley: U. of California Press, 1968.

[24]These thoughts are an extrapolation of Conrad Hal Waddington's, *Behind Appearances*. Mass.: MIT Press, 1970.

[25]"Scientism" is the belief that the scientific values of instrumentalism, efficiency and prediction as exhibited by the positivist method can solve any problem.

[26]Karl Popper, *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. London: Hutchinson, 1959.

[27]Ludwig von Bertalanffy, *Perspectives on General Sustem Theory*. New York: George Braziller, 1975.

[28]Renato Poggiolo, *Theory of the Avant-Garde*. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press, 1968.

[29]Jack Burnham, *Beyond Modern Sculpture*. New York: George Braziller, 1968.

[30]Jack Burnham, "The Aesthetics of Intelligent Systems," in *On the Future of Art*, edited by the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, N.Y.: The Viking Press, 1970.

[31]Abraham Moles, *Information Theory and Esthetic Perception*. Trans. by Joel E. Cohen. Urbana: U of Illinois Press, 1966. and, Max Bense, "The Projects of Generative Aesthetics," *Cybernetics, Art and Ideas*, edited by Jasin Reichardt. Greenwich, Conn.: N.Y. Graphic Society, 1971.

[32]This notion is an extrapolation of T. Brunius' work *Mutual Aid in the Arts*. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wisell, 1972.

[33]This idea is best expressed by Meyer Schapiro, *Cezanne*. New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1952, and Merleau Ponty "Eye and Mind," in *The Primacy of Perception*. Evanston: Northwestern U. Press, 1964.

[34]Wassily Kandinsky, *Concerning the Spiritual in Art, and Painting in Particular*. New York: Wittenborn, Schultz, 1947.

[35]For the development of the "emic" view in anthropology as it relates to the "etic" view of the natural sciences, see Marvin Harris, *The Rise of Anthropological Theory*. N.Y.: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1968.

[36]E. Husserl, *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1970.

[37]Kenneth R. Beittel, *Alternatives for Art Education Research*. Dubuque, Iowa: WM.C. Brown Publishers, 1973, and Joan Novosel-Beittel, "Inquiry into the Qualitative World of Creating: The S-E Model," in *Studies in Art Education* Vol 20, #1, 1978.

[38]See Note 8.

[39]J. Bronowski, *Science and Human Values*. H.Y.: Harper, 1965.

[40]See Note 4.

[41] See P. Berger and T. Luchmann, *The Social Construction of Reality*. New York, Garden City: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1966.

[42] I would think the Alfred Schutz held such a view in *Alfred Schutz Collected Papers I: The Problem of Social Peality*. Edited by M. Natanson, The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1973.

[43] Max van Manen, *Languages of Deep Structure in Curriculum Inquiry*. Unpublished manuscript, 1978.

[44] As I perceive them to be:

1) Paul Pohlard, "Participant Observation," *Studies in Art Education*, 13, #3,4.
2) Charles G. Wieder, "Alternative Approaches to Problems in Art Education," *Studies in Art Education*, 17, #1,2.
3) Jerry W. Morris, "An Alternative Methodology For Researching Art Attitudes and Values," *Studies in Art Education*, 17, #1,3. and
4) Rosalie L. Asch, "A Critical Look at Textbooks For Consistency Between Theory and Practice," *Studies in Art Education*, 16, #1,4.

[45] A biological explanation is given by Berlyne, *Aesthetics and Fsychobiology*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1971. and the Arnheimian notion of "visual thinking" is also a physiological-biological explanation of the aesthetic response.

[46] H. Marcuse, "Essences" in *Negations*. Boston: Boston Press, 1969.

[47] T. Kotarbinski, *Praxiology*. Longon: Pergamon Press, 1965.

[48] Jack Burnham, *Hans Haacke, Framing and Being Framed*. Halifax: Press of the Nova Scotia College of Art and Design, 1975.

[49] Clive Bell, *Art*. New York: Capricorn, 1958, p. 160.